

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7-19 and 21-68, as amended, remain herein.

Applicants believe that this amendment places this application fully in condition for allowance, and surely places it in better condition for any appeal. Accordingly, entry of this amendment and allowance of all claims 1-5, 7-19 and 21-68 are respectfully requested.

1. Claims 3, 7, 8, 17, 18, 20, 21 and 53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Wagner U.S. Patent 5,933,130. Claim 20 is canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Wagner discloses an anti-eye strain system that automatically varies the brightness of the display on a periodic basis. By varying the brightness on a periodic basis, Wagner claims to reduce eye-strain. However, Wagner does not disclose the acquisition of luminance information. Thus, Wagner does not disclose either that luminance setting values are determined from measured luminance information of the pixels during successive video blanking periods, or that the measured luminance information is acquired by an array of anodes in the display panel positioned over the pixels, as claimed by applicants.

For all of the foregoing reasons, Wagner does not disclose all elements of applicants' claimed invention and therefore is not a proper basis for a §102 rejection thereof. Nor is there any disclosure or teaching in Wagner that would have suggested applicants' claimed invention. Thus reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection, and allowance of all claims 3, 7, 8, 17, 18, 21 and 53 are respectfully requested.

2. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 9, 13-16, 19, 22, 24, 25, 30-43, 45-52, 54-57, 62-66 and 68-70 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Wagner and Fan U.S. Patent 6,097,356. Claims 6, 69 and 70 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Serial No.: 10/089,802
Docket No.: 28951.3110

As discussed above, Wagner does not disclose luminance setting values determined from measured luminance information of the pixels during successive video blanking periods, as claimed by applicants.

Fan does not disclose what is missing in Wagner. Fan is cited for teaching a method of calibrating a field emission display (FED) or cathode ray tube (CRT), if there is a degrading effect. However, Fan discloses a single initial calibration of luminescence, not a periodic changes in the renewal intervals. Thus, Fan does not disclose luminance setting values determined from measured luminance information of the pixels during successive video blanking periods, as claimed by applicants.

For all of the foregoing reasons, there is no disclosure or teaching in either of Wagner or Fan that would have suggested applicants' claimed invention to one of ordinary skill in this art. Further, there is no disclosure or teaching in either Wagner or Fan that would have suggested the desirability of combining any portions thereof effectively to anticipate or suggest applicants' claimed invention. Withdrawal of this rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 9, 13-16, 19, 22, 24, 25, 30-43, 45-52, 54-57, 62-66 and 68, and allowance of the same are therefore respectfully requested.

3. Claims 26-29 and 58-61 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Wagner, Matthies, and Doherty U.S. Patent 5,619,228.

Claims 26-29, which depend upon claim 3, and claims 58-61, which depend upon claim 36, are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 3 and 36.

Matthies does not disclose what is missing in Wagner. Matthies discloses an OLED pixel structure. The pixel driving circuitry is located on the back side of the pixel structures and connections to pixel electrodes on the front side of the structure are made by vias that pass

Serial No.: 10/089,802
Docket No.: 28951.3110

through portions of selected ones of the pixel areas that are not occupied by the active pixel material. Matthies discloses calibration of pixels using sensors to measure individual pixel brightness and means to communicate a corrected drive voltage to the display electronics; see Matthies, col. 11, lines 34-46 and col. 12 lines 34-47.

Matthies also discloses a compensation system that adjusts the brightness of individual pixels to compensate for aging; see col. 11, line 61 – col. 12, line 33. Matthies discloses calibration of pixels by mounting pixels onto a test fixture that has photocells. Matthies. means of calibration is separate from the display. Further, Matthies is configured to measure the information only once. Thus, Matthies does not disclose determining measuring luminance information of the pixels during successive blanking periods, as claimed by applicants. Matthies also does not disclose measured luminance information acquired by an array of anodes in the display panel positioned over the pixels, as claimed by applicants.

Doherty does not disclose what is missing in Wagner or Matthies. Doherty discloses providing gray shade control, but not determining measuring luminance information of the pixels during successive blanking periods, or measuring luminance information acquired by an array of anodes in the display panel positioned over the pixels, as claimed by applicants.

For all of the foregoing reasons, there is no disclosure or teaching in any of Wagner, Matthies and/or Doherty that would have suggested applicants' claimed invention to one of ordinary skill in this art. Further, there is no disclosure or teaching in any of Wagner, Matthies and/or Doherty that would have suggested the desirability of combining any portions thereof effectively to anticipate or suggest applicants' claimed invention. Withdrawal of this rejection of claims 24, 30-33 and 62-65 and allowance of the same are therefore respectfully requested.

Serial No.: 10/089,802
Docket No.: 28951.3110

4. Claims 10-12 and 44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Wagner in view of Matthies, further in view of Ando et al. U.S. Patent 4,672,275.

Claims 10-12, which depend upon claim 3, and claim 44, which depends upon claim 40, are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 3 and 40.

Ando does not disclose what is missing in Wagner or Matthies. Ando discloses correcting luminance setting values during vertical blanking periods, but not measuring luminance information acquired by an array of anodes in the display panel positioned over the pixels, as claimed by applicants.

For all of the foregoing reasons, there is no disclosure or teaching in any of Wagner, Matthies and/or Ando that would have suggested applicants' claimed invention to one of ordinary skill in this art. Further, there is no disclosure or teaching in any of Wagner, Matthies and/or Ando that would have suggested the desirability of combining any portions thereof effectively to anticipate or suggest applicants' claimed invention. Withdrawal of this rejection of claims 26-29 and 58-61 and allowance of the same are therefore respectfully requested.

5. Claims 23 and 67 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Wagner in view of Matthies, further in view of Xie et al. U.S. Patent 6,025,819.

Claims 23 and 67, which depend from claims 3 and 36 respectively, are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 23 and 67.

Xie does not supply what is missing in Wagner or Matthies. Xie discloses a display panel that includes gamma corrections, but not determining measuring luminance information of the pixels during successive blanking periods, or measuring luminance information acquired by an array of anodes in the display panel positioned over the pixels, as claimed by applicants

Serial No.: 10/089,802
Docket No.: 28951.3110

For all of the foregoing reasons, there is no disclosure or teaching in any of Wagner, Matthies and/or Xie that would have suggested applicants' claimed invention to one of ordinary skill in this art. Further, there is no disclosure or teaching in any of Wagner, Matthies and/or Xie that would have suggested the desirability of combining any portions thereof effectively to anticipate or suggest applicants' claimed invention. Withdrawal of this rejection of claim 23 and 67 and allowance of the same are therefore respectfully requested.

Accordingly, this application is now fully in condition for allowance, and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested. The PTO is hereby authorized to charge/credit any fee deficiencies or overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-4293 (Order No. 28951.3110). If further amendments would place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is invited to call applicant's undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

STEPTOE & JOHNSON



Roger W. Parkhurst, Reg. No. 25,177
Tyson Y. Winarski, Reg. No. 41,381

Date: September 25, 2006

Steptoe & Johnson LLP
1330 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036
Tel: 202-429-3000
Fax: 202-429-3902

RWP/TYW:mn1